

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 5, 2004 and the Advisory Action dated November 26, 2004. Applicant requests entry of the Amendment After Final Rejection dated August 5, 2004. This Preliminary Amendment is further to the Amendment After Final Rejection. Claims 22 to 27 are pending in the application, with Claims 26 and 27 having been added. Claims 22 to 25 have been amended, and Claims 22 and 24 are in independent form. Favorable review and early passage to issue are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 to 3, 6, 12 to 15, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,594,672 (Hicks) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,438,359 (Aoki), and Claims 4, 5, 7 to 11, 16, 17, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over Hicks in view of Aoki and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,821,924 (Kikinis). Although the rejections are believed to be obviated by the cancellation of the rejected claims, Applicant submits that Claims 22 to 27 are allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth below. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention generally concerns a peripheral apparatus which is connectable to a computer. The peripheral apparatus includes a control unit which controls the peripheral apparatus and a power control unit which controls supply of power from a battery connected to the peripheral apparatus to the control unit. According to one feature of the invention, a check is made whether or not a predetermined request is received from the computer, and a decision is made to supply power from the battery to the control unit if it is determined that the predetermined request is received from the computer.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 22 as amended is directed to a peripheral apparatus which is connectable to a computer. The peripheral apparatus includes a control unit which controls the peripheral apparatus, and a power control unit which controls supply of power from a battery connected to the peripheral apparatus to the control unit. The control unit checks whether or not a predetermined request is received from the computer. The power control unit decides to supply power from the battery to the control unit if it is determined that the predetermined request is received from the computer.

In addition, independent Claim 24 as amended is directed to a method which substantially corresponds to independent Claim 22.

The art of record is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the invention of the subject application. In particular, the Hicks, Aoki and Kikinis patents are not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of checking whether or not a predetermined request is received from a computer, and deciding to supply power from a battery connected to the peripheral apparatus to a control unit, which controls the peripheral apparatus, if it is determined that the predetermined request is received from the computer.

As understood by Applicant, Hicks teaches a device that saves energy by turning on power to a peripheral device such as a printer only when a host computer sends data to its I/O port. See Hicks, Abstract. When the computer I/O port shows some activity, power is supplied to the peripheral and the transition is mediated between the peripheral's power on state and ready state. When the computer I/O port shows no activity, power to the peripheral is eliminated. See Hicks, column 1, lines 60 to 66.

Although Hicks may be seen to describe controlling power supply to a peripheral device, it bases its decision to supply power on whether activity is present on the computer I/O port. This is different than the present invention, in which a check is made whether a predetermined request is received from the computer.

The Advisory Action alleges that the microprocessor 39/49 and button 35 of Hicks check whether a predetermined request is received from the computer. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Hicks teaches that the button 35 of a peripheral device may be used for controlling time limits or defining characteristics of the I/O port. See Hicks, column 3, line 59. However, nothing in the description of button 35 or microprocessor 39/49 is seen to disclose or suggest that a check is made based on information received from the computer, muchless that a check is made whether a predetermined request is received from the computer. Accordingly, Hicks is not seen to disclose or suggest checking whether or not a predetermined request is received from a computer, and deciding to supply power from a battery connected to the peripheral apparatus to a control unit, which controls the peripheral apparatus, if it is determined that the predetermined request is received from the computer.

As understood by Applicant, Aoki describes an electronic camera with a power circuit that can be supplied power from a battery within the camera or the power source of a personal computer. The power circuit is supplied with power from the battery when the camera is not connected to the personal computer. When the camera is connected to the personal computer, the power supply to the power circuit from the battery is automatically switched to the power supply from the power source of the personal computer. See Aoki, column 4, lines 14 to 20.

Although Aoki may provide for switching the power supply from the battery within the camera to the power source of the personal computer, Aoki is silent as to checking whether a predetermined request is received from the computer.

The Advisory Action cites to column 4, lines 21 to 30 for this alleged disclosure, in which a writing/reading circuit writes data onto and reads data from an IC memory card in a predetermined format in accordance with a control signal output from a system control circuit. The writing/reading circuit also writes and reads data onto and from the IC memory card in a predetermined format in accordance with the control signal output from a personal computer.

However, Aoki's writing and reading of data in a predetermined format is not seen to teach or to disclose checking whether a predetermined request is received from the computer. In Aoki, it is the format of the data written to or read from the IC memory card which is predetermined. This is different than the present invention, in which a check is made whether a predetermined request is received from the computer. Accordingly, Aoki is not seen to disclose or suggest checking whether or not a predetermined request is received from a computer, and deciding to supply power from a battery connected to the peripheral apparatus to a control unit, which controls the peripheral apparatus, if it is determined that the predetermined request is received from the computer.

As understood by Applicant, Kikinis discloses a monitor with a switch. A sync detect circuit monitors a SYNC signal on a VGA cable. Loss of the monitored SYNC signal causes the sync detect circuit to change the voltage on a power-control line, which in turn causes the switch to open and the monitor to shut down. Resumption of the SYNC signals in the VGA cable causes the sync detect circuit to change the power-control line to

a quiescent state, thus causing the electronically-controlled switch to close and restore power to the monitor. See Kikinis, column 6, lines 12 to 34.

Although Kikinis may be seen to disclose detecting a signal to control the ON and OFF states of a switch for powering a monitor, it bases its decision on whether a SYNC signal is active on a VGA cable. This is different than the present invention, in which a check is made whether a predetermined request is received from the computer. Moreover, Kikinis is not seen to disclose that its monitor has a battery, from which power is supplied to the control unit if it is determined that the predetermined request is received from the computer.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing, independent Claims 22 and 24 as amended are believed to be allowable over the art of record.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,  
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to  
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'E. Kmett', is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant  
Edward A. Kmett  
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 90139v1